

To achieve these goals and objectives, Kyrgyzstan is full of resolve and will to comprehensively encourage and develop friendly, good-neighbourly relations of partnership with all the countries of the Great Silk Road region and to participate consistently and concretely in integration processes.—Askar Akaev, President of Kyrgyzstan.

DECISION ON IRAQ

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I want to have printed in the RECORD an op-ed by columnist Charles Krauthammer discussing the United Nations and its debate over how to deal with Iraq. Mr. Krauthammer makes the point that nations are driven by their own self-interests; thus, members of the U.N. Security Council—such as France, Russia, and China—all have varied perspectives on a potential confrontation with Iraq.

He argues that it is not “unseemly” for the United States to similarly act in the name of its own interests. And that it is, in his words, an “absurdity” to suggest that the U.S. is suddenly granted “moral legitimacy” by U.N. Security Council approval for its actions, since the Security Council itself is composed of member states acting in their own self interests.

I ask unanimous consent the op-ed by Mr. Krauthammer be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THIS THE WAY TO DECIDE ON IRAQ?

(By Charles Krauthammer)

There is something deeply deranged about the Iraq debate.

The vice president, followed by the administration A Team and echoing the president, argues that we must remove from power an irrational dictator who has a history of aggression and mass murder, is driven by hatred of America and is developing weapons of mass destruction that could kill millions of Americans in a day. The Democrats respond with public skepticism, a raised eyebrow and the charge that the administration has yet to “make the case.”

Then on Sept. 12, the president goes to the United Nations and argues that this same dictator must be brought to heel to vindicate some Security Council resolutions and thus rescue the United Nations from irrelevance. The Democrats swoon. “Great speech,” they say. “Why didn’t you say that in the first place? Count us in.”

When the case for war is made purely in terms of American national interest—in terms of the safety, security and very lives of American citizens—chins are pulled as the Democrats think it over. But when the case is the abstraction of being the good international citizen and strengthening the House of Kofi, the Democrats are ready to parachute into Baghdad.

This hierarchy of values is bizarre but not new. Liberal internationalism—the foreign policy school of the modern Democratic Party (and of American liberalism more generally)—is deeply suspicious of actions taken for reasons of naked interest. After all, this is the party that in the last decade voted overwhelmingly against the Persian Gulf War, where vital American interests were at stake (among them, keeping the world’s largest reservoir of oil out of the hands of a hostile dictator), while supporting humani-

tarian military interventions in Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia and Kosovo, places with only the remotest connection to American security interests.

This is all sweet and nice. And highly, flat-teringly moral. But is this the way to decide when to risk the lives of brave young Americans?

This fawning over the president’s rescue-the-U.N. rationale is not just sentimental, it is illogical. Assume—big assumption—that the United Nations does act and passes a resolution magnanimously allowing Americans to fight and die in Iraq. How does that rescue the United Nations from irrelevance? Under a feckless U.S. administration that allowed things to drift, the United Nations sat on its hands through the 1990s and did nothing. If not for this American president who threatens to invade on his own if he has to, the United Nations would still be doing nothing. The United Nations is irrelevant one way or the other. It is acting now only because of American pressure. It will go back to sleep tomorrow when America eases that pressure.

And what is the moral logic underlying the Democrats’ demand for U.N. sanctions? The country’s top Democrat, Sen. Tom Daschle, said that U.N. support “will be a central factor in how quickly Congress acts. If the international community supports it, if we can get the information we’ve been seeking, then I think we can move to a [Senate] resolution.”

Daschle’s insistence on the centrality of a U.N. stamp of approval is puzzling. How does this work? In what way does the approval of the Security Council confer moral legitimacy on this enterprise? Perhaps Daschle can explain how the blessing of the butchers of Tiananmen Square, who hold the Chinese seat on the Security Council, lends moral authority to an invasion of Iraq. Or the support of the Kremlin, whose central interest in Iraq is the \$8 billion that it owes Russia.

Or the French. There can be no Security Council approval without them. Does Daschle imagine that their approval will hinge on humanitarian calculations? If the French come on board it will be because they see an Anglo-American train headed for Baghdad and they don’t want to be left at the station. The last time the Middle East was carved up was 1916, when a couple of British and French civil servants, a Mr. Sykes and a Mr. Picot, drew lines on a map of the crumbling Ottoman Empire. Among other goodies, France got Syria and Lebanon. Britain got Iraq. The French might not relish being shut out of Iraq a second time.

My point is not to blame France or China or Russia for acting in their national interests. That’s what nations do. That’s what nations’ leaders are supposed to do. My point is to express wonder at Americans who find it unseemly to act in the name of their own national interests and who cannot see the logical absurdity of granting moral legitimacy to American action only if it earns the approval of the Security Council—approval granted or withheld on the most cynical ground of self-interest.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of last year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred August 19, 2000 in

Los Altos, CA. A gay man and his friend were assaulted outside a hair salon. The assailant, Peter Ellsworth, used anti-gay epithets during the attack. Mr. Ellsworth has been charged in connection with the incident.

I believe that Government’s first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ANGELS IN ADOPTION

• Mrs. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the individuals, organizations, and families who open their hearts to adoptive children. Children around the world, in Cambodia, in Romania, and in our own country wait desperately for families to care and provide for them. The parents who adopt these needy children turn their lives around and offer them a brighter future filled with love and hope.

As a member of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption, I would like to recognize the efforts of parents, adoption agencies, support groups and other individuals whose dedication to adoption makes a difference in the lives of children. Adoption provides countless children with stable homes, caring families and loving supportive parents. In particular, I would like to honor Dennis and Debbie Sparrow of Saint Louis, Missouri. This year, I have nominated the Sparrows as “Angels in Adoption” for their hard work and dedication to adoptive children from Romania. The “Angels in Adoption” award is presented by the Congressional Coalition on Adoption to recognize those who enrich the lives of adoptive children.

Dennis and Debbie Sparrow adopted their first child from Romania in 1991. During the adoption process, the Sparrows saw firsthand how many of the children in orphanages are destined for a life of poverty and hardship. Upon their return, Dennis and Debbie started two organizations to benefit the children they saw in Romania. S.E.E.K., Save Eastern Europe’s Kids, collects donations for Romanian orphans and their caregivers. S.E.E.K. International, a non-profit adoption agency, assists prospective parents and children through the adoption process. In addition to helping over 100 children find loving homes, the Sparrows have personally adopted five children.

The Sparrows’ exemplary work demonstrates that individuals can make a great difference. They have provided invaluable resources and support to other families wishing to bring Romanian children into their lives. They have raised money to assist in the care